



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,347	10/693,347 10/24/2003 7590 03/08/2006		Ethan Joseph Bernstein	60001.0278US01/MS# 304257	2716
				EXAM	INER
Leonard J. H	Iope		RIES, LAURIE ANNE		
Merchant & (Gould P.O	C.			
P.O. Box 290	3		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Minneapolis,	MN 55	5402-0903	2176		
				DATE MAILED: 03/08/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/693,347	BERNSTEIN ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
_	Laurie Ries	2176					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,							
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim viil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 Oc	ctober 2003.						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •							
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.							
	☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 October 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
·	ammor. Note the attached emoc	7,000,01,011,11,10,102.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
<i>, , ,</i>	a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
_ , , , ,							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO 412)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)							
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Statement(s) (PTO-152) Other:							
1 apei 110(3)/101aii Date <u>5/ 1/54</u> .							

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kunitake (U.S. Publication 2001/0018697 A1).

As per claims 1, 9, and 10, Kunitake discloses a method, apparatus and computer readable medium for merging source documents into a destination document, where the source document or the destination document or both contain one or more markup language tags having a start tag or an end tag or both a start tag and an end tag (See Kunitake, Page 1, paragraph 0003, Page 17, paragraphs 0465-0471, and Page 21, paragraphs 0604-0612) including comparing the source document and the destination document to identify one or more matching document parts, equivalent to blocks, and one or more difference blocks (See Kunitake, Page 3, paragraph 0055, and Page 4, paragraph 0063), splitting all matching blocks that contain a markup language tag for which only a start tag or an end tag has been matched so that the matched markup language tags are no longer matched, splitting all matching blocks that contain a markup language tag for which either the start tag or the end tag has been matched to a different tag in the other document so that the matched markup language tags are no longer matched, and splitting any matching blocks containing markup language tags that would create overlapping tags when merged (See Kunitake, Page 9, paragraphs 0223-0227, Page 4, paragraphs 0060-0065, and Page 21, paragraphs 0588-0590).

Art Unit: 2176

Kunitake also discloses merging the matching and difference blocks (See Kunitake, Page 5, paragraph 0069).

Kunitake does not disclose expressly that the merged document markup language tags are well-formed. It was well known in the art at the time of the invention that a well-formed document allows a markup language file to be read by all Web browsers without difficulty (See Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Page 565, definition of "well-formed"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to conclude that the merged document of Kunitake was well-formed. The motivation for this conclusion would have been that the merged or synthesized document of Kunitake was capable of being displayed on a Web browser (See Kunitake, Pages 23-24, paragraphs 0666-0706, and Figure 25).

As per claim 2, Kunitake discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Kunitake also discloses determining whether a markup language tag from the source document has a start tag but not an end rag in the difference block, and in response to determining that the difference block contains a start tag but not an end tag, locating the furthest difference block containing the matching end tag of such a tag in the source document, identifying an inner range of matching and difference blocks as each of the blocks between the current block and the furthest difference block, identifying an outer range of matching and difference blocks as the current difference block and the furthest difference block and the furthest difference block and each of the matching and difference blocks in-between, identifying each markup language tag that has a start tag within the inner range and an end tag outside the outer range and, for each identified markup language tag, discarding all

Art Unit: 2176

matching blocks within the inner range prior to the start tag, and identifying each markup language tag that has a end tag within the inner range and a start tag outside the outer range and, for each identified markup language tag, discarding all matching blocks within the inner range prior to the end tag (See Kunitake, Pages 8-9, paragraphs 0142-0242, and Page 21, paragraphs 0591-0598).

As per claim 3, Kunitake discloses the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Kunitake also discloses processing each matching block and difference block in order, for each matching block, copying the text from the source or destination document in the matching block into the merged document, and for each difference block, copying the text from the source or destination document in the difference block into the merged document if the difference block contains text only from either the source or destination document (See Kunitake, Pages 14-15, paragraphs 0356-0360).

As per claim 4, Kunitake discloses the limitations of claim 3 as described above. Kunitake also discloses creating a label for each markup language tag that has only either a start tag or an end tag in the difference block, the label including a non-zero integer identifying the number of blocks to the difference block containing the matching start or end tag (See Kunitake, Page 8, paragraphs 0130-0142, Page 10, paragraphs 0244-0246, and Page 12, paragraphs 0301-0305).

As per claim 5, Kunitake discloses the limitations of claim 4 as described above. Kunitake also discloses that text is copied from each sub-block into the merged document in the arranged order (See Kunitake, Page 14, paragraphs 0354-0356, and Page 15, paragraph 0359).

Application/Control Number: 10/693,347 Page 5

Art Unit: 2176

As per claim 6, Kunitake discloses the limitations of claim 5 as described above. Kunitake also discloses that text in the sub-block from the source document is copied just prior to text from the sub-block from the destination document if the sub-block has a negative label (See Kunitake, Page 22, paragraphs 0649-0654).

As per claim 7, Kunitake discloses the limitations of claim 6 as described above. Kunitake also discloses that text in the sub-block from the source document is copied just after text in the sub-block from the destination document if the sub-block has a positive label (See Kunitake, Page 22, paragraphs 0649-0657).

As per claim 8, Kunitake discloses the limitations of claim 7 as described above. Kunitake also discloses that comparing the source document and the destination document to identify one or more matching blocks and one or more difference blocks includes matching a markup language tag in the source document to a markup language tag in the destination document only if each aspect of the markup language tag in the source document is identical to each aspect of the markup language tag in the destination document (See Kunitake, Page 10, paragraph 0247).

Conclusion

- The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - Lin discloses discovering informative content blocks from Web documents.

Art Unit: 2176

 Unger (U.S. Patent 6,886,130 B1) discloses a compiled structure for efficient operation of distributed hypertext.

- Birsan (U.S. Patent 6,848,078 B1) discloses a comparison of hierarchical structures and merging of differences.
- Sorge (U.S. Patent 6,565,609 B1) discloses translating data into HTML
 while retaining formatting and functionality for returning the translated data to a parent application.
- 3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.
- 4. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
3/5/2006

Page 6